

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-11 have been amended for better clarity and conformance to U.S. practice, such as beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and changing "characterized in that" to "--wherein--". Claims 1-11 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-10 and 11-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over a

compending Application No. 10/524,181. Further, claims 5 and 15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over a compending Application No. 10/524,181 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,222 (Lengyel). Claims 6, 16 and 18-19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over a compending Application No. 10/524,181 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,726,722 (Uehara).

These rejections are respectfully traversed. However, to advance prosecution and expedite allowance, a Terminal Disclaimer is included herein. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 12-13, 15 and 20 are objected to for certain informalities. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 1, 12-13, 15 and 20 have been amended to remove the informalities noted by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the objection of claims 1, 12-13, 15 and 20 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or

averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
November 22, 2006

Enclosure: New Abstract
Terminal Disclaimer

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101